DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 293 184 CS 506 109

AUTHOR Nitcavic, Richard G.; Aitken, Joan E.
TITLE Inclusion Expectancies of the Adolescent Handicapped as They Interact with Teachers and Peers.
PUB DATE Apr 88
NOTE 32p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Central States Speech Association (Schaumburg, IL, April 16-18, 1988).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Adolescent Development; Disabilities; Educational Research; Elementary Education; *Mainstreaming; Middle Schools; *Normalization (Handicapped); *Q Methodology; *Self Concept; Self Concept Measures; Special Education; Speech Communication
IDENTIFIERS Communication Behavior; Communication Patterns; Expectancy Theory; *Mainstreaming the Disadvantaged

ABSTRACT

By the mid-1970s, several pieces of federal legislation were passed requiring that handicapped or exceptional children be educated "in the least restrictive environment." The resulting "mainstreaming" of special children in regular classrooms has caused certain expectancies and special inclusion needs. To find out more about the perceptions of mainstreamed children a study examined interpersonal needs and expectations among students in grades 6 to 8. The method used was to apply Q Methodology to the study of the patterned perceptions of special children who have been mainstreamed into a required middle school class. Approximately 500 students (including those labeled "handicapped") in required computer literacy classes from a midwestern county school, were tested to determine their communication self-concept. Only 340 of the tests were completed correctly and usable for data analysis. Five significant types of students emerged: (1) The Capable; (2) The Ego; (3) The Outcast; (4) The Reticent; and (5) The Okay Kid. Results suggest that Q is a useful technique for examining the interrelationships among interpersonal needs of adolescents; that a majority of the special students appeared to function successfully in a regular classroom; and that reticence is the major problem of one-third of the special students. (Three tables are included, and 30 references and lists for item descriptions and descending array of z-scores for types 1-5 are appended.) (MS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED293184

Inclusion Expectancies of the Adolescent Handicapped as They Interact with Teachers and Peers

Richard G. Nitcavic
Ball State University

Joan E. Aitken
University of Missouri--Kansas City

Richard G. Nitcavic (Ph.D., 1979, University of Missouri) is Chairman of the Department of Speech Communication, Ball State University, Muncie, IN 47306. Joan E. Aitken (Ed.D., 1985, University of Arkansas) is a Visiting Assistant Professor in the Department of Communication Studies, University of Missouri--Kansas City 64110-2499.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Joan E. Aitken

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

CS 506 109

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

Over a decade ago, federal legislation required that handicapped or exceptional children be educated "in the least restrictive environment." The resulting "mainstreaming" of special children in regular classrooms has caused certain expectancies and special inclusion needs. The authors sought to identify expectations among public school students in grades 6 through 8, as they interacted in a required computer literacy class at the middle school level. Q Methodology was used to examine the expectations of 340 students, including those labeled "handicapped." The investigation resulted in the identification of five types of students. The investigation revealed that a majority of the special students appeared to function successfully in a regular classroom. The investigation found reticence to be the major problem of one third of the special students.

Prior to the mid-1970s, children with intellectual, physical, or emotional problems typically were educated separately from other children. Several pieces of federal legislation--Public Laws 94-142, 94-482, and Section 503 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973--have encouraged the inclusion of exceptional persons in the mainstream of society and the American educational system. These laws emphasize stress-free, appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment, entrance to vocational programs, individualized instructional programs, accessibility of programs and facilities, and nondiscriminatory practices for disabled children (Parks, Taylor, Cox and Russell, 1981). Hence, special children can now be "mainstreamed," or taught in the regular classroom.

While some parents have found the mainstreaming choice to be a good one for their children, others have opted for the more protective environment of the special education classroom (Marks, 1986, p. 90). Being physically included does not guarantee emotional inclusion. When exceptional children are in separate classes, they are in a unique environment geared specifically for their needs. In special classes, the children may associate with other special children, work in small classes, and be accepted as similar to those around them. Although they may be "exceptional" when mainstreamed, they are "typical" among other children with dysfunctions. These exceptional children may experience a stronger sense of community and inclusion when among other children similarly labeled, particularly in early coping stages.

When a child first realizes the impact of his or her disability, for example, companionship from other children with disabilities may be particularly helpful. Having a teacher trained in special education also may prove advantageous for the child. Through mainstreaming, however, special children may have an educational experience more similar to that of other children and learn to adapt better to society as a whole. The main concern is whether mainstreaming will cause damage to a particular child's self-esteem (Marks, 1986).

The number of handicapped children in the United States has exceeded four million (Neisworth & Smith, 1983). Special children may be identified by their peers as different because of their development, appearance, size, coordination, speech, or other factors. Thus, questions arise regarding the acceptance and inclusion of special children by their peers. Perceived differences could create problems in effective mainstreaming. One area of concern is the behavior of special children. Student behavioral problems act as an area of potential conflict in mainstreaming. Aggression, for example, may be a problem with some special children:

> Student aggression in the classroom has long been a recurring problem for teachers of exceptional students...Aggression may be displayed verbally or physically to classmates or teachers. The aggression may have devastating effects on the learning environment, and if continued, pervasive long-term effects on a student's social

> maturation. A student who is aggressive to classmates elicits aggression in return, and often becomes unpopular and unhappy. (VanNagel, 1984)

Although it may be a difficult process, parents, school personnel, and children can make mainstreaming work. "Ways have been found to integrate students with severe disabilities into public settings while maintaining and extending a necessary level of quality and intensity of programming" (Ferguson & Searl, 1981). Yet relatively little is known about the perceptions of mainstreamed children. Certainly, the advantages and disadvantages of mainstreaming are significant concerns among both parents and educators, and the expectations and inclusion needs of exceptional children are among those concerns. The nature of the expectations of children as related to self-esteem in the regular classroom is the primary concern of this paper. In particular, the authors examined interpersonal needs and expectations among middle school students.

Relationship to Expectancy Theory

Whether we call them "handicapped," "special," or "exceptional" children, the label immediately brings with it certain expectations. Parents, teachers, administrators, and fellow students view exceptional students as having special needs and as differing in their abilities and functions. These real and perceived differences have the potential for causing unique expectancies among and about special students. Selove (1984) defined expectancies as "those states of mind in which

future events are imagined and judged in terms of probabilities" (p. 4). If one considers the expectancy theory of Vroom (1964, 1965), one would anticipate that the effort and performance of special children should relate to their perceived self-concept regarding their assimilation in the mainstreamed classroom. If the child, parent, teacher, or classmates have reservations about the mainstreaming process, it may adversely affect the child's motivation and success.

Vroom's expectancy theory has been used as a theoretical basis for various research studies (e.g. Masen, 1984; Dossett & Luce, 1984; Malloch & Micheal, 1981), some of which have proven to be critical of the theory (Butler & Womer, 1985; Wilson, cone, Busch, & Allee, 1983). Certainly, one would expect a highly motivated special child to more successful in the mainstreamed classroom than a poorly motivated special child and perhaps even an unmotivated unlabeled child. If Maddux (1984) is correct, for example, in that expectancy is a basic factor in psychological and behavioral problems, expectancy could influence a child positively or negatively, depending on the expectancy of the child and those around him or her. As Henderson (1980) explained: "How much a person is motivated depends on the intensity of the needs and the degree of satisfaction anticipated" (p. 623). By examining the self-esteem of a child (and related expectancies), one should be able to predict the child's performance.

Inclusion, Affection, and Control

Schutz (1958) identified inclusion, affection and control as the three major components of interpersonal communication. In their extensive review of the literature pertaining to relational communication, Burgoon and Hale (1984) identified 12 distinguishable dimensions but reported that "the three traditional recognized dimensions of control, affection, and inclusion are well represented across disciplinary perspectives, theories, and the lines of empirical inquiry" (p. 210). These three interpersonal needs were chosen as particularly significant to the experiences of exceptional children.

Inclusion. According to Indvik and Fitzpatrick (1986), "inclusion means attracting attention and interest and being differentiated from others. Inclusion differs from affiliation [or affection] in that it does not incorporate strong emotional attachment and from control in that it emphasizes attention rather than dominance" (p. 2). One might expect that exceptional children--by virtue of being different--and their differences being a source of attention--would readily feel inclusion. Based on their review of literature, Indvik and Fitzpatrick identified five factors of inclusion: "accessibility, similarity, evaluation, stimulation, and relational potential" (p. 2). One might expect mainstreamed exceptional children to less easily attain some of these factors. One should note, however, that Montgomery (1986) criticized Indvik and Fitzpatrick for their conceptual and methodological

decisions. Whether or not the five factors provide the most valid theoretical constructs is irrelevant in a Q study such as this one. The factors can serve as a way of looking at the inclusion needs of exceptional children in the mainstreaming process. The manner in which the subjects sort statements reflecting these factors will determine the usefulness of the constructs.

Accessibility. Mainstreaming makes exceptional children accessible to other students. The accessibility component probably represents the most important aspect of mainstreaming, by providing special children with a greater variety of potential experiences and acquaintances.

Similarity. In contrast, similarity represents the greatest obstacle for inclusion of special children through mainstreaming. When the child looks or acts differently from the other children, he or she will not be perceived as similar. Yet the mainstreamed child may be able to perceive more similarities than differences with normal children. When one child was asked how handicapped children were different from her, she responded "we're all pretty much the same." Children who are used to being with exceptional children from their earliest schooling may be better able to perceive similarities, especially when certain physical or developmental differences are less apparent.

Evaluation. Exceptional children may receive different forms of evaluation in the regular classrooms as compared to the special education classrooms, but when they are mainstreamed,

special children may receive evaluation more similar to normal children. Whether they are called " fun," ugly, smart, or one of hundreds of other adjectives, they will receive evaluation which helps shape their self expectations and their relations with others. Additionally, the patterns of evaluation they develop towards others in the class will help shape their desires to be included.

Stimulation. The dimension of stimulation shows high potential for the mainstreaming process. Certainly the regular classroom with its variety of students, abilities, and experiences holds promise for stimulation of special children.

Relational Potential. Whether or not a child is in a regular or special classroom, relational potential exists. Special children can communicate with the children around them. Although the communication patterns may differ--in hearing or visually impaired, for example--the children have an opportunity to develop relationships and expectations that the relationships will continue of alter in the future.

Affiliation. Indvik and Fitzpatrick identified in the literature four dimensions of the affection (or affiliation) factor that appeared relevant to special children: acceptance, openness, caring, and empathy (1986, p. 3).

Control. The abilities and dispositions of exceptional children to control their environment is generally considered the essential rationale for mainstreaming.

Method

The original approach of this study was to apply Q Methodology (Stephenson, 1953) to the study of the patterned perceptions of special children who have been mainstreamed into a required middle school class. In the study of interpersonal perceptions--an area in which researchers are still developing its component factors--Q Methodology shows promise. With over 1500 studies using Q Methodology or Q Technique to date (Brown, 1986), the method has proven useful in research in communication, education, and special education (e.g. Barchak, 1984; Cragan & Shields, 1981; Stephen, 1985; Hansen & Fillmore, 1983; Nelson, 1984; Plog, 1982).

The authors modified a structured Q sort which was developed for the purpose of measuring one's communication self-concept (Nitcavic, 1979). At the foundation of the sort were the needs for inclusion, affiliation, and control. Because one's abilities are important when accounting for the perceptions of special students, statements related to perceived ability also were included.

The Q sort contained 48 statements, half semantically positive and half semantically negative. Twelve questions each were constructed to reflect perceptions of inclusion, affection, control, and ability.

Subjects. The subjects were students in required computer literacy classes in a midwestern county school of 700 students. The students ranged in classification from the 6th through the

8th grades. Approximately 500 students completed the Q sort, including exceptional students who were mainstreamed in the computer literacy classes (17% were labeled mildly mentally handicapped, learning disabled, physically handicapped, or low reading ability). All classes were instructed by the same teacher, who was certified in elementary education and special education.

Administration. The Q sorts were administered on a single day to each class, at the end of the fourth week of a six-week course. Standard protocols were followed. Students did ask questions, however, about the procedure. The students were asked to sort the statements "as you see yourself in this class." The student had approximately 40 minutes to complete the sort.

Although students were asked to place a statement on the floor once they had recorded its number, many students recorded numbers more than once or failed to complete the sort in the allotted time. A few Q sorts were modified (i.e., completed) when the student failed to place the last few numbers in the neutral area of the sort. In cases where the students used numbers more than once--hence failing to use all numbers--the Q sort was not included in the data analysis. While approximately one fourth of the sorts of unlabeled students were disqualified from analysis, approximately half of the sorts of special students were excluded. No sort completed by a mildly mentally handicapped student was usable.

Analysis. The data were analyzed using QUANAL (Van Tubergen), a program designed to process Q sorts. The program computes correlations between sorts and submits the results to factor analysis. Varimax rotation was requested.

Because the number of subjects (N = 340) exceeded the capacity of QUANAL, the data were partitioned. The analyses produced four, three-factor solutions, each accounting for approximately 40 percent of the variance among the sorts. The typal arrays associated with the factors were analyzed again. This second-order factor analysis again yielded a three-factor solution accounting for over 76 percent of the variance among the individual typal arrays. When factors are reflected, meaning individual sorts load negatively on them, QUANAL creates a new type from the negatively loading sorts. Because both factors 1 and 2 were reflected, five types resulted from the three-factor solution. The individual sorts of the 350 subjects were correlated with the master types to identify each individual's "type."

Results

Among the 340 subjects, 58 failed to load significantly ($p < .01$) on any of the master types. Thirty three special children and 244 unlabeled children loaded purely on one and only one type; 38 subjects correlated significantly with more than one master type. (See Table 1)

Table 1

SIGNIFICANT CORRELATIONS TO MASTER TYPES
(Numbers off the diagonal indicate individuals loading on more than one type)

	Type 1	2	3	4	5
Type 1	161	8		16	5
2		25	3		
3			30	5	
4				20	1
5					8

The correlations among types (see Table 2) indicate that type 1, type 2, and type 3 are distinctly different. Type 4 and type 5 are significantly related, in a negative direction, to type 2 and type 3 respectively. Additionally, type 4 and type 5 are significantly related, indicating they are variations on an underlying theme.

Table 3 presents the distribution of "pure" factor loading among special and unlabeled students.

Table 2

PRODUCT-MOMENT CORRELATIONS BETWEEN TYPES

	Type 1	2	3	4	5
1	1.000	.101	-.077	.188	.255
2		1.000	-.067	-.669	.101
3			1.000	.429	-.600
4				1.000	-.106
5					1.000

The array for each type appears at the end of this document. Below is a brief description of each type.

Table 3

DISTRIBUTION OF PURE TYPES

	Type None	1	2	3	4	5
Special student	12	12	5	1	10	5
Unlabeled	46	149	20	29	10	3

Type 1: The Capable. Most salient to the type 1 person were statements pertaining to inclusion and affiliation. Eight of the 12 inclusion statements were placed at least one standard deviation higher than were the average placements by the other four types. The type 1 student claimed to like most of the

students in the class and to think they are "great people" who are friendly. Type 1 students perceived positive relational potential by indicating they think they will stay friends with a lot of the students in the class and by disagreeing most strongly with the statement "I won't have much to do with the students in this class once it's over." The type 1 students not only were attracted to classmates but also looked toward future relationships with their peers.

Although the type 1 students viewed their abilities positively, they appeared to be more concerned with positive social relationships than with their abilities. Ability statements at least one standard deviation from the center of the sort pertained to their ability to learn quickly and easily, their confidence in both their ideas and their ability to organize ideas, and to their ability to speak without mannerisms. Similarly, the type 1 students tended to look positively at their ability to control but placed control statements toward the center of the sort. Their agreement with the negative control statement "I don't like to argue with other students" and their disagreement with the positive statement "I usually try to get others to do things my way" suggests they limit efforts to control in order to meet their substantial needs for inclusion and affiliation.

Of the students with a pure typal loading, 27 percent of the special students and 58 percent of the unlabeled students loaded on this factor. While it is not surprising that more unlabeled

students considered themselves capable than did special students, it is noteworthy that over one out of four special students viewed themselves so favorably. Well over half of all of the students loaded on type 1.

Type 2: The Ego. Type 2 students appeared to be preoccupied with their abilities and their need to control. Of the ten statements with which type 2 students most strongly agreed, four pertained to the positive assessment of their abilities and four to their desire to control. Similarly, they disagreed most strongly with two negative statements relating to control. In virtually a misanthropic manner, they most strongly agreed that students in the class are boring and aren't worth listening to and strongly disagreed that there were a lot of great people in the class. Although they claimed that they do not avoid engaging in conversation, they did so less strongly than did the other types. Their assertions that they do not avoid arguments or class discussion appeared related to their need to communicate in less intimate situation.

Although a slightly higher percentage of special students (11 percent) than unlabeled students (8 percent) loaded on type 2, the difference was minimal.

Type 3: The Outcast. Type 3 students tended to agree with negative statements and disagree with positive ones pertaining to inclusion, control and affiliation. On the other hand, they claimed strong scholarly abilities. Feelings of alienation

appeared to be salient among type 3 students. They reacted strongly and negatively to statements pertaining to affiliation: their feelings are easily hurt, they don't know how others feel, they don't like to talk about themselves, and they fail to see other students as caring about them. Additionally, they perceived an inability to express their thoughts and feelings. Their placement of control statements indicated they lack the skills and attitudes needed to control their environment. They most strongly disagreed with the statement that they try to get others to do things their way. Their strong endorsement of having the teacher enforce class rules suggested they desire external control in their environment. Noteworthy was the tendency of type 3 students to place statements pertaining to inclusion toward the center of the sort. There were, however, major exceptions. One of the two statements with which they most strongly disagreed was "I have a lot in common with the students in this class." Additionally, they agreed fairly strongly with the item "Other students don't seem to understand my thoughts and feelings." Both inclusion statements pertain to perceived similarity.

While only one special student (2 percent) loaded on type 3, 29 unlabeled students (over 11 percent) conformed most closely to the outcast.

Type 4: The Reticent. Type 4 students appeared to be reticent. Although they liked the students in the class and them friendly, type 4 students were sensitive individuals who did not

like to argue, speak up in class, or speak about themselves. More than any other type, they claimed not express their feelings, instead preferring to fade into the background. Their lack of confidence in general was supported by their negative views concerning their communication and academic skills. Although they endorsed inclusion statements pertaining to evaluation and relational potential, they tended to reject sentiments dealing with accessibility and similarity. In other words, they seemed to like and want to stay (or perhaps become) friends with their peers, but reported they are different from others and have problems getting close to their peers.

While nearly one quarter of the special students loaded on type 4, only 4 percent of unlabeled students did. Half of the reticent students in this sample were special students.

Type 5: The Okay Kid. Statements pertaining to inclusion, affiliation, and control respectively appeared at the extreme positions of this sort. These students tended to agree with positive statements and disagree with negative statements pertaining to inclusion and affiliation. The reverse held for statements pertaining to control. When compared to type 1 students, type 5 students indicated a perception of lower ability a less favorable evaluation of their peers, and a greater tendency to argue. Type 5 students not only indicated a perception of similarity to their peers but also reported a high need for affiliation. Hence, they appeared less reticent than type 4 students. Although type 5 students seemed to know their

limitations, they claimed not to let them interfere with their willingness to communicate with others. They reported they feel basically accepted by others and have few cares.

Although on 8 students loaded on type 5, 5 were special students. Only 1 percent of the unlabeled students conformed to this description.

Conclusions

The results of the investigation suggest Q is a useful technique for examining the interrelationships among interpersonal needs of adolescents. Five significant types of students emerged. The types accounted for approximately 40 percent of the variance among the sorts.

The majority of the students emerged as type 1 (The Capable) or failed to emerge on any factor. While the methodology used may have failed to measure the attitudes of 17 percent of the students, an alternative explanation is that the students randomly assigned numbers to the Q sort. Type 2 (The Ego), type 3 (The Outcast), and type 4 (The Reticent) each described from 8 to 12 percent of the students. Little more than 1 percent emerged on type 5 (The Okay Kid), and the majority were special students.

Only The Capable and The Okay Kid appeared to view their relationships with peers positively. For the most part, they indicated high inclusion and high affection for their peers. The Okay Kids lacked the confidence, the ability, and (probably) the social skills of The Capable students, yet did not let weaknesses

interfere were their stressing their similarities with other students. Both unlabeled and exceptional children loaded on these factors, indicating a successful experience in mainstreaming in these cases.

In almost equal percentages, special and unlabeled students loaded on type 2 (The Ego), a type indicating negative expectancies. Such individuals appeared to be more preoccupied with their abilities and their need to control than with their inclusion and affection needs. Perhaps such individuals have failed to learn ways to give and seek inclusion, The possibilities deserve additional investigation.

Type 3 (The Outcast) reported considerable alienation. Although over 10 percent of the unlabeled students conformed to this misanthropic profile, the pattern was rare among special students. While they reportedly possessed academic abilities, the Outcasts perceived themselves as substantially different from their peers. It may be that academically or creatively talented students see themselves as less like their peers than do special students. The extent of such extreme lack of inclusion combined with considerable perceptions of lack of control warrants serious investigation of such unlabeled students. Perhaps there is a group of "socially disabled" or "alienated" students who are missing classification as "emotionally disturbed."

Half of the students labeled "The Reticent" were special children. While one third of the special children reported type 4 characteristics, only 4 percent of the unlabeled students did. These individuals appeared to wish to be included. On the other

hand, they appeared to lack confidence and skills to communicate with others. Perhaps communication professionals best contribute to managing the problems of the special student by helping teachers learn to deal with reticent individuals.

In follow-up investigations, the authors will seek to identify the behaviors and performances associated with the four interpersonal types.

References

Barchak, Leonard J. (1984, July). Discovering communication paradigms with Q methodology: ferment or sour grapes? Operant Subjectivity, 7, 115-130.

Brantlinger, Ellen A., & Guskin, Samuel L. (1985, September). Implications of social and cultural differences for special education with specific recommendations. Focus on Exceptional Children, 18, 1-12.

Brown, Steven R. (1986). Q technique and method: Principles and procedures. In W. D. Berry and M. S. Lewis-Beck (Eds.) New tools for social scientists: Advances and applications in research methods. Beverly Hills: Sage Publication.

Burgoon, Judee K. & Hale, Jerold L. (1984, September). The fundamental topoi of relational communication. Communication Monographs, 51(3), 193-214.

Butler, John K., Jr., & Womer, Norman Keith. (1985, July). Hierarchical vs. non-nested tests for contrasting expectancy-valence models: Some effects of cognitive characteristics. Multivariate Behavioral Research, 20, 335-352.

Cragan, John F. & Shields, Donald C. (Eds.) (1981). Applied communication research. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.

Dossett, Dennis L., & Luce, Helen E. (1984, August). Goal setting and expectancy theory predictions of effort and performance. Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the

American Psychological Association (92nd, Toronto, Ontario, Canada). (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED 254 776)

Ferguson, Dianne & Searl, Stanford J., Jr. (1981). The challenge of integrating students with severe disabilities. Syracuse Univ., NY. Special Education Resource Center. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 236 831)

Hansen, Donald A. & Fillmore, Lily Wong. (1983, September). Locating learning: The social context of second-language acquisition. California University, Berkley, Graduate School of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 255 067)

Henderson, Karla A. (1980). Programming volunteerism for happier volunteers. Parks & Recreation, 15(9), 61-64.

Indvik, Julie & Fitzpatrick, Mary Anne. (1986, Winter). Perceptions of inclusion, affiliation, and control in five interpersonal relationships. Communication Quarterly, 34(1), 1-13.

Mack, Jean Harris. (1980, December). An analysis of state definitions of severely emotionally disturbed. Council for Exceptional Children, Reston, Virginia Policy Research Center. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 201 135)

Maddux, James E., & Barnes, Jo Ann. (1984, August). Cognitive processes in psychotherapy and behavior change: Self-efficacy expectancy, outcome expectancy, and outcome value. Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association (92nd, Toronto, Ontario, Canada).

(ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 251 738)

Malloch, Douglas C., & Michael, William B. (1981). Prediction student grade point average at a community college from scholastic aptitude tests and from measures representing three constructs in Vroom's expectancy theory model of motivation. Educational and psychological Measurement, 41, 1127-1135.

Mason, A. Magid. (1984, August). A multimethod assessment of Holland's congruency: The expectancy and multidimensional scaling routes. Paper presented at the annual Convention of the American Psychological Association (92nd, Toronto, Ontario, Canada). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 225 806)

Marks, Jane. (1986, September). Raising a child who's different. Parents, pp. 90-176.

Montgomery, Barbara M. (1986, Winter). A commentary on Indvik and Fitzpatrick's study of relationship defining communication, Communication Quarterly, 34(1), 14-18.

Nelson, Gary D. (1984, November). Assessment of health decision making skills of adolescents. Paper presented at the Mid-south Educational Research Association (13th, New Orleans, LA) (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 252 774)

Neisworth, J. T., & Smith, R. M. Educational similarities and differences. In R. M. Smith, J. T. Neisworth, F. M. Hunt (Eds) The exceptional child. New York: McGraw Hill.

Nitcavic, Richard G. (1979, December). A descriptive study of input and output variables in a multiple-approach basic speech

course. Doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri-Columbia.

Parks, A. Lee, Taylor, G. Cleve, Cox, Dave & Russell, Fred. (1981). Secondary special education programs. Idaho State Board of Vocational Education, Boise. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 206 800)

Plog, Michael. (1982, July) Handbook for evaluation of special education effectiveness. Illinois State Dept. of Education, Springfield, Div. of Specialized Educational Services. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 221 985)

Schutz, W. C. (1958). FIRO: A three-dimensional theory of interpersonal behavior. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Selove, Rebecca (1884, August). Relationships among teachers' expectations and school organizational variables. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association (Toronto, Ontario. Canada). (ERIC Reproduction Service No. ED 254 906)

Stephen, Timothy D. (1985, Summer). Q-methodology in communication science: An introduction. Communication Quarterly, 33(3), 193-208.

Van Naagel, Clement, Deering-Levin, Sharian. (1984, April). The art of managing verbal aggression in the classroom. Paper presented at the annual convention of the Council for Exceptional Children (62nd, Washington, D.C., April 23-27, 1984) ERIC Document Reproduction service No. ED 245 456)

Van Tubergen, N. (1975). QUANAL user guide. (Computer program manual). Lexington, KY: Dept. of Communication, University of Kentucky.

Vroom, Victor H. (1964). Work and motivation. New York: Wiley.

Vroom, Victor H. (1965). Motivation in management. New York: American Foundation for Management Research Study.

Wilson, Lonny R., Cone, Thomas E., Busch, Robert, & Alle, Terry. (1983, April). A critique of the expectancy formula approach: Beating a dead Horse? Psychology in the Schools, 20, 241-249.

ITEM DESCRIPTIONS AND DESCENDING ARRAY OF Z-SCORES FOR TYPE 1

ITEM DESCRIPTION	Z-SCORE
47. MOST STUDENTS IN THIS CLASS ARE FRIENDLY.	1.83
44. I THINK I WILL STAY FRIENDS WITH A LOT OF THE STUDENTS IN THIS CLASS.	1.81
37. I LIKE MOST OF THE STUDENTS IN THIS CLASS.	1.73
1. THERE ARE A LOT OF GREAT PEOPLE IN THIS CLASS.	1.36
10. IN GENERAL, I LEARN QUICKLY AND EASILY.	1.12
40. I HAVE GREAT CONFIDENCE IN MANY OF MY OWN IDEAS.	1.06
26. I DON'T LIKE TO ARGUE WITH OTHER STUDENTS.	1.03
13. WHEN I FEEL I'M RIGHT, I SPEAK UP.	1.01
39. I CAN DO THE ASSIGNMENTS IN THIS CLASS RATHER QUICKLY AND EASILY.	1.00
41. I ADAPT AND ADJUST WELL TO THE REACTIONS OF PEOPLE I'M TALKING TO.	0.95
15. OTHER STUDENTS IN THIS CLASS WILL HELP ME OUT IF I HAVE A PROBLEM.	0.83
5. I HAVE A LOT IN COMMON WITH THE STUDENTS IN THIS CLASS.	0.82
38. I THINK THE TEACHER SHOULD MAKE STUDENTS OBEY CLASS RULES.	0.82
2. I LIKE TO BE SEEN AND HEARD. IT MAKES ME FEEL GOOD TO KNOW THAT I'M IMPRESSING OTHERS.	0.74
48. I USUALLY LET PEOPLE KNOW IF I LIKE OR DISLIKE THEM OR WHAT'S HAPPENING.	0.69
46. PEOPLE IN THIS CLASS SEEM TO CARE ABOUT ME AS A PERSON.	0.66
31. THE STUDENTS IN THIS CLASS LIKE ME THE WAY I AM.	0.50
19. I FEEL FREE TO TELL OTHER STUDENTS WHAT I THINK AND FEEL ABOUT THINGS.	0.48
43. I'M BETTER AT SOME THINGS THAN MOST OF THE STUDENTS IN THIS CLASS.	0.42
21. I EXPRESS MYSELF CLEARLY ONLY ON THOSE SUBJECTS I KNOW WELL.	0.37
4. WHEN I SPEAK UP IN THIS CLASS, I USUALLY COME ACROSS COOL AND COLLECTED, EVEN WHEN I'M NERVOUS.	0.36
11. I LIKE THE SURPRISES THAT COME WHEN I TALK TO PEOPLE IN THIS CLASS.	0.31
45. WHEN SOMETHING REALLY UPSETS ME, I MUST TALK TO SOMEONE ABOUT IT.	0.26
36. ALL IN ALL, I USE MY VOICE AND BODY WELL WHEN I TALK.	0.17
16. I DON'T LIKE TO TALK ABOUT MYSELF.	0.16
17. IT BOTHERS ME WHEN OTHER STUDENTS DON'T LIKE WHAT I'M DOING.	0.12
28. I OFTEN FIND IT DIFFICULT TO EXPRESS WHAT I FEEL INSIDE OF ME.	0.12
27. OTHER STUDENTS THINK I'M SMART.	0.11
42. I'M BETTER THAN MOST STUDENTS AT KNOWING HOW OTHERS FEEL.	-0.24
9. MY FEELINGS ARE EASILY HURT WHEN OTHER STUDENTS PUT ME DOWN.	-0.32
12. WHEN OTHER STUDENTS IN THIS CLASS ARE HAVING PROBLEMS, I FIGURE IT'S NONE OF MY BUSINESS.	-0.38
25. OTHER STUDENTS DON T SEEM TO UNDERSTAND MY THOUGHTS AND FEELINGS.	-0.64
3. MOST STUDENTS I KNOW TALK AND LISTEN BETTER THAN I DO.	-0.69
34. I DON'T LIKE TO SPEAK UP IN THIS CLASS BECAUSE I GET REAL NERVOUS.	-0.91
20. IT'S HARD FOR ME TO TALK OTHERS INTO DOING THINGS.	-0.92
33. I STICK OUT AS BEING DIFFERENT FROM MOST STUDENTS IN THIS CLASS.	-0.95
30. I'M NOT AS INTERESTING AS MOST STUDENTS IN THIS CLASS.	-1.00
29. I'D RATHER WATCH AND LISTEN THAN GET INTO A CONVERSATION.	-1.00
24. I HAVE DIFFICULTY ORGANIZING MY IDEAS.	-1.06
7. I TEND TO GIVE IN RATHER EASILY WHEN OTHERS PUT PRESSURE ON ME.	-1.08
6. WHEN I TALK, I HAVE MANNERISMS THAT DISTRACT FROM MY SPEAKING.	-1.09
35. I USUALLY TRY TO GET OTHERS TO DO THINGS MY WAY.	-1.20
18. MOST STUDENTS IN THIS CLASS ARE RUDE.	-1.30
14. I FEEL UNEASY AROUND MOST STUDENTS IN THIS CLASS.	-1.45
32. OTHER STUDENTS SEEM TO IGNORE ME.	-1.46
22. MOST STUDENTS IN THIS CLASS AREN'T WORTH LISTENING TO.	-1.59
23. THE STUDENTS IN THIS CLASS ARE BORING.	-1.77
8. I WON'T HAVE MUCH TO DO WITH THE STUDENTS IN THIS CLASS ONCE IT'S OVER.	-1.78

ITEM DESCRIPTIONS AND DESCENDING ARRAY OF Z-SCORES FOR TYPE 2

ITEM DESCRIPTION	Z-SCORE
23. THE STUDENTS IN THIS CLASS ARE BORING.	1.58
40. I HAVE GREAT CONFIDENCE IN MANY OF MY OWN IDEAS.	1.57
13. WHEN I FEEL I'M RIGHT, I SPEAK UP.	1.54
22. MOST STUDENTS IN THIS CLASS AREN'T WORTH LISTENING TO.	1.45
43. I'M BETTER AT SOME THINGS THAN MOST OF THE STUDENTS IN THIS CLASS.	1.36
48. I USUALLY LET PEOPLE KNOW IF I LIKE OR DISLIKE THEM OR WHAT'S HAPPENING.	1.26
39. I CAN DO THE ASSIGNMENTS IN THIS CLASS RATHER QUICKLY AND EASILY.	1.19
2. I LIKE TO BE SEEN AND HEARD. IT MAKES ME FEEL GOOD TO KNOW THAT I'M IMPRESSING OTHERS.	1.08
36. ALL IN ALL, I USE MY VOICE AND BODY WELL WHEN I TALK.	1.08
41. I ADAPT AND ADJUST WELL TO THE REACTIONS OF PEOPLE I'M TALKING TO.	1.05
16. I DON'T LIKE TO TALK ABOUT MYSELF.	1.04
10. IN GENERAL, I LEARN QUICKLY AND EASILY.	0.90
18. MOST STUDENTS IN THIS CLASS ARE RUDE.	0.79
19. I FEEL FREE TO TELL OTHER STUDENTS WHAT I THINK AND FEEL ABOUT THINGS.	0.72
35. I USUALLY TRY TO GET OTHERS TO DO THINGS MY WAY.	0.59
4. WHEN I SPEAK UP IN THIS CLASS, I USUALLY COME ACROSS COOL AND COLLECTED, EVEN WHEN I'M NERVOUS.	0.49
31. THE STUDENTS IN THIS CLASS LIKE ME THE WAY I AM.	0.45
25. OTHER STUDENTS DON T SEEM TO UNDERSTAND MY THOUGHTS AND FEELINGS.	0.35
27. OTHER STUDENTS THINK I'M SMART.	0.34
21. I EXPRESS MYSELF CLEARLY ONLY ON THOSE SUBJECTS I KNOW WELL.	0.33
11. I LIKE THE SURPRISES THAT COME WHEN I TALK TO PEOPLE IN THIS CLASS.	0.32
15. OTHER STUDENTS IN THIS CLASS WILL HELP ME OUT IF I HAVE A PROBLEM.	0.28
46. PEOPLE IN THIS CLASS SEEM TO CARE ABOUT ME AS A PERSON.	0.25
33. I STICK OUT AS BEING DIFFERENT FROM MOST STUDENTS IN THIS CLASS.	0.24
44. I THINK I WILL STAY FRIENDS WITH A LOT OF THE STUDENTS IN THIS CLASS.	0.14
8. I WON'T HAVE MUCH TO DO WITH THE STUDENTS IN THIS CLASS ONCE IT'S OVER.	0.12
42. I'M BETTER THAN MOST STUDENTS AT KNOWING HOW OTHERS FEEL.	-0.01
17. IT BOTHERS ME WHEN OTHER STUDENTS DON'T LIKE WHAT I'M DOING.	-0.14
12. WHEN OTHER STUDENTS IN THIS CLASS ARE HAVING PROBLEMS, I FIGURE IT'S NONE OF MY BUSINESS.	-0.16
28. I OFTEN FIND IT DIFFICULT TO EXPRESS WHAT I FEEL INSIDE OF ME.	-0.33
45. WHEN SOMETHING REALLY UPSETS ME, I MUST TALK TO SOMEONE ABOUT IT.	-0.53
6. WHEN I TALK, I HAVE MANNERISMS THAT DISTRACT FROM MY SPEAKING.	-0.55
3. MOST STUDENTS I KNOW TALK AND LIKTEN BETTER THAN I DO.	-0.55
37. I LIKE MOST OF THE STUDENTS IN THIS CLASS.	-0.67
47. MOST STUDENTS IN THIS CLASS ARE FRIENDLY.	-0.71
32. OTHER STUDENTS SEEM TO IGNORE ME.	-0.74
24. I HAVE DIFFICULTY ORGANIZING MY IDEAS.	-0.89
7. I TEND TO GIVE IN RATHER EASILY WHEN OTHERS PUT PRESSURE ON ME.	-0.98
30. I'M NOT AS INTERESTING AS MOST STUDENTS IN THIS CLASS.	-1.03
5. I HAVE A LOT IN COMMON WITH THE STUDENTS IN THIS CLASS.	-1.05
14. I FEEL UNEASY AROUND MOST STUDENTS IN THIS CLASS.	-1.17
9. MY FEELINGS ARE EASILY HURT WHEN OTHER STUDENTS PUT ME DOWN.	-1.21
20. IT'S HARD FOR ME TO TALK OTHERS INTO DOING THINGS.	-1.29
29. I'D RATHER WATCH AND LISTEN THAN GET INTO A CONVERSATION.	-1.34
34. I DON'T LIKE TO SPEAK UP IN THIS CLASS BECAUSE I GET REAL NERVOUS.	-1.48
1. THERE ARE A LOT OF GREAT PEOPLE IN THIS CLASS.	-1.52
26. I DON'T LIKE TO ARGUE WITH OTHER STUDENTS.	-2.00
38. I THINK THE TEACHER SHOULD MAKE STUDENTS OBEY CLASS RULES.	-2.14

ITEM DESCRIPTIONS AND DESCENDING ARRAY OF Z-SCORES FOR TYPE 3

	ITEM DESCRIPTION	Z-SCORE
9.	MY FEELINGS ARE EASILY HURT WHEN OTHER STUDENTS PUT ME DOWN.	1.71
17.	IT BOTHERS ME WHEN OTHER STUDENTS DON'T LIKE WHAT I'M DOING.	1.65
39.	I CAN DO THE ASSIGNMENTS IN THIS CLASS RATHER QUICKLY AND EASILY.	1.52
10.	IN GENERAL, I LEARN QUICKLY AND EASILY.	1.50
28.	I OFTEN FIND IT DIFFICULT TO EXPRESS WHAT I FEEL INSIDE OF ME.	1.48
38.	I THINK THE TEACHER SHOULD MAKE STUDENTS OBEY CLASS RULES.	1.44
25.	OTHER STUDENTS DON T SEEM TO UNDERSTAND MY THOUGHTS AND FEELINGS.	1.43
26.	I DON'T LIKE TO ARGUE WITH OTHER STUDENTS.	1.42
43.	I'M BETTER AT SOME THINGS THAN MOST OF THE STUDENTS IN THIS CLASS.	1.32
16.	I DON'T LIKE TO TALK ABOUT MYSELF.	1.26
18.	MOST STUDENTS IN THIS CLASS ARE RUDE.	1.08
32.	OTHER STUDENTS SEEM TO IGNORE ME.	0.85
40.	I HAVE GREAT CONFIDENCE IN MANY OF MY OWN IDEAS.	0.79
14.	I FEEL UNEASY AROUND MOST STUDENTS IN THIS CLASS.	0.71
33.	I STICK OUT AS BEING DIFFERENT FROM MOST STUDENTS IN THIS CLASS.	0.57
29.	I'D RATHER WATCH AND LISTEN THAN GET INTO A CONVERSATION.	0.47
34.	I DON'T LIKE TO SPEAK UP IN THIS CLASS BECAUSE I GET REAL NERVOUS.	0.45
20.	IT'S HARD FOR ME TO TALK OTHERS INTO DOING THINGS.	0.35
45.	WHEN SOMETHING REALLY UPSETS ME, I MUST TALK TO SOMEONE ABOUT IT.	0.28
21.	I EXPRESS MYSELF CLEARLY ONLY ON THOSE SUBJECTS I KNOW WELL.	0.26
22.	MOST STUDENTS IN THIS CLASS AREN'T WORTH LISTENING TO.	0.26
12.	WHEN OTHER STUDENTS IN THIS CLASS ARE HAVING PROBLEMS, I FIGURE IT'S NONE OF MY BUSINESS.	-0.12
30.	I'M NOT AS INTERESTING AS MOST STUDENTS IN THIS CLASS.	-0.14
2.	I LIKE TO BE SEEN AND HEARD. IT MAKES ME FEEL GOOD TO KNOW THAT I'M IMPRESSING OTHERS.	-0.18
23.	THE STUDENTS IN THIS CLASS ARE BORING.	-0.26
13.	WHEN I FEEL I'M RIGHT, I SPEAK UP.	-0.33
6.	I WON'T HAVE MUCH TO DO WITH THE STUDENTS IN THIS CLASS ONCE IT'S OVER.	-0.38
41.	I ADAPT AND ADJUST WELL TO THE REACTIONS OF PEOPLE I'M TALKING TO.	-0.39
48.	I USUALLY LET PEOPLE KNOW IF I LIKE OR DISLIKE THE OR WHAT'S HAPPENING.	-0.40
7.	I TEND TO GIVE IN RATHER EASILY WHEN OTHERS PUT PRESSURE ON ME.	-0.45
11.	I LIKE THE SURPRISES THAT COME WHEN I TALK TO PEOPLE IN THIS CLASS.	-0.47
24.	I HAVE DIFFICULTY ORGANIZING MY IDEAS.	-0.57
37.	I LIKE MOST OF THE STUDENTS IN THIS CLASS.	-0.60
27.	OTHER STUDENTS THINK I'M SMART.	-0.62
47.	MOST STUDENTS IN THIS CLASS ARE FRIENDLY.	-0.62
3.	MOST STUDENTS I KNOW TALK AND LIKTEN BETTER THAN I DO.	-0.69
44.	I THINK I WILL STAY FRIENDS WITH A LOT OF THE STUDENTS IN THIS CLASS.	-0.76
36.	ALL IN ALL, I USE MY VOICE AND BODY WELL WHEN I TALK.	-0.84
31.	THE STUDENTS IN THIS CLASS LIKE ME THE WAY I AM.	-0.86
1.	THERE ARE A LOT OF GREAT PEOPLE IN THIS CLASS.	-0.94
15.	OTHER STUDENTS IN THIS CLASS WILL HELP ME OUT IF I HAVE A PROBLEM.	-1.05
4.	WHEN I SPEAK UP IN THIS CLASS, I USUALLY COME ACROSS COOL AND COLLECTED, EVEN WHEN I'M NERVOUS.	-1.06
42.	I'M BETTER THAN MOST STUDENTS AT KNOWING HOW OTHERS FEEL.	-1.19
19.	I FEEL FREE TO TELL OTHER STUDENTS WHAT I THINK AND FEEL ABOUT THINGS.	-1.23
6.	WHEN I TALK, I HAVE MANNERISMS THAT DISTRACT FROM MY SPEAKING.	-1.30
46.	PEOPLE IN THIS CLASS SEEM TO CARE ABOUT ME AS A PERSON.	-1.72
5.	I HAVE A LOT IN COMMON WITH THE STUDENTS IN THIS CLASS.	-1.76
35.	I USUALLY TRY TO GET OTHERS TO DO THINGS MY WAY.	-1.79

ITEM DESCRIPTIONS AND DESCENDING ARRAY OF Z-SCORES FOR TYPE 4

ITEM DESCRIPTION	Z-SCORE
26. I DON'T LIKE TO ARGUE WITH OTHER STUDENTS.	2.79
9. MY FEELINGS ARE EASILY HURT WHEN OTHER STUDENTS PUT ME DOWN.	1.97
34. I DON'T LIKE TO SPEAK UP IN THIS CLASS BECAUSE I GET REAL NERVOUS.	1.72
37. I LIKE MOST OF THE STUDENTS IN THIS CLASS.	1.63
28. I OFTEN FIND IT DIFFICULT TO EXPRESS WHAT I FEEL INSIDE OF ME.	1.43
47. MOST STUDENTS IN THIS CLASS ARE FRIENDLY.	1.36
38. I THINK THE TEACHER SHOULD MAKE STUDENTS OBEY CLASS RULES.	1.21
1. THERE ARE A LOT OF GREAT PEOPLE IN THIS CLASS.	1.16
25. OTHER STUDENTS DON T SEEM TO UNDERSTAND MY THOUGHTS AND FEELINGS.	1.06
24. I HAVE DIFFICULTY ORGANIZING MY IDEAS.	0.96
16. I DON'T LIKE TO TALK ABOUT MYSELF.	0.72
30. I'M NOT AS INTERESTING AS MOST STUDENTS IN THIS CLASS.	0.64
44. I THINK I WILL STAY FRIENDS WITH A LOT OF THE STUDENTS IN THIS CLASS.	0.57
33. I STICK OUT AS BEING DIFFERENT FROM MOST STUDENTS IN THIS CLASS.	0.51
32. OTHER STUDENTS SEEM TO IGNORE ME.	0.37
12. WHEN OTHER STUDENTS IN THIS CLASS ARE HAVING PROBLEMS, I FIGURE IT'S NONE OF MY BUSINESS.	0.35
3. MOST STUDENTS I KNOW TALK AND LIKTEN BETTER THAN I DO.	0.27
7. I TEND TO GIVE IN RATHER EASILY WHEN OTHERS PUT PRESSURE ON ME.	0.25
29. I'D RATHER WATCH AND LISTEN THAN GET INTO A CONVERSATION.	0.14
43. I'M BETTER AT SOME THINGS THAN MOST OF THE STUDENTS IN THIS CLASS.	0.10
39. I CAN DO THE ASSIGNMENTS IN THIS CLASS RATHER QUICKLY AND EASILY.	0.07
45. WHEN SOMETHING REALLY UPSETS ME, I MUST TALK TO SOMEONE ABOUT IT.	-0.10
14. I FEEL UNEASY AROUND MOST STUDENTS IN THIS CLASS.	-0.17
6. WHEN I TALK, I HAVE MANNERISMS THAT DISTRACT FROM MY SPEAKING.	-0.22
18. MOST STUDENTS IN THIS CLASS ARE RUDE.	-0.22
10. IN GENERAL, I LEARN QUICKLY AND EASILY.	-0.29
20. IT'S HARD FOR ME TO TALK OTHERS INTO DOING THINGS.	-0.30
15. OTHER STUDENTS IN THIS CLASS WILL HELP ME OUT IF I HAVE A PROBLEM.	-0.32
13. WHEN I FEEL I'M RIGHT, I SPEAK UP.	-0.35
5. I HAVE A LOT IN COMMON WITH THE STUDENTS IN THIS CLASS.	-0.39
21. I EXPRESS MYSELF CLEARLY ONLY ON THOSE SUBJECTS I KNOW WELL.	-0.42
42. I'M BETTER THAN MOST STUDENTS AT KNOWING HOW OTHERS FEEL.	-0.44
19. I FEEL FREE TO TELL OTHER STUDENTS WHAT I THINK AND FEEL ABOUT THINGS.	-0.45
31. THE STUDENTS IN THIS CLASS LIKE ME THE WAY I AM.	-0.45
17. IT BOTHERS ME WHEN OTHER STUDENTS DON'T LIKE WHAT I'M DOING.	-0.47
11. I LIKE THE SURPRISES THAT COME WHEN I TALK TO PEOPLE IN THIS CLASS.	-0.55
46. PEOPLE IN THIS CLASS SEEM TO CARE ABOUT ME AS A PERSON.	-0.64
40. I HAVE GREAT CONFIDENCE IN MANY OF MY OWN IDEAS.	-0.65
41. I ADAPT AND ADJUST WELL TO THE REACTIONS OF PEOPLE I'M TALKING TO.	-0.79
8. I WON'T HAVE MUCH TO DO WITH THE STUDENTS IN THIS CLASS ONCE IT'S OVER.	-0.91
2. I LIKE TO BE SEEN AND HEARD. IT MAKES ME FEEL GOOD TO KNOW THAT I'M IMPRESSING OTHERS.	-1.19
27. OTHER STUDENTS THINK I'M SMART.	-1.28
36. ALL IN ALL, I USE MY VOICE AND BODY WELL WHEN I TALK.	-1.33
48. I USUALLY LET PEOPLE KNOW IF I LIKE OR DISLIKE THEM OR WHAT'S HAPPENING.	-1.33
22. MOST STUDENTS IN THIS CLASS AREN'T WORTH LISTENING TO.	-1.38
4. WHEN I SPEAK UP IN THIS CLASS, I USUALLY COME ACROSS COOL AND COLLECTED, EVEN WHEN I'M NERVOUS.	-1.43
35. I USUALLY TRY TO GET OTHERS TO DO THINGS MY WAY.	-1.60
23. THE STUDENTS IN THIS CLASS ARE BORING.	-1.65

ITEM DESCRIPTIONS AND DESCENDING ARRAY OF Z-SCORES FOR TYPE 5

	ITEM DESCRIPTION	Z-SCORE
5.	I HAVE A LOT IN COMMON WITH THE STUDENTS IN THIS CLASS.	2.20
47.	MOST STUDENTS IN THIS CLASS ARE FRIENDLY.	2.10
31.	THE STUDENTS IN THIS CLASS LIKE ME THE WAY I AM.	1.80
37.	I LIKE MOST OF THE STUDENTS IN THIS CLASS.	1.40
44.	I THINK I WILL STAY FRIENDS WITH A LOT OF THE STUDENTS IN THIS CLASS.	1.40
46.	PEOPLE IN THIS CLASS SEEM TO CARE ABOUT ME AS A PERSON.	1.40
15.	I FEEL FREE TO TELL OTHER STUDENTS WHAT I THINK AND FEEL ABOUT THINGS.	1.10
34.	I DON'T LIKE TO SPEAK UP IN THIS CLASS BECAUSE I GET REAL NERVOUS.	1.00
11.	I LIKE THE SURPRISES THAT COME WHEN I TALK TO PEOPLE IN THIS CLASS.	0.90
33.	I STICK OUT AS BEING DIFFERENT FROM MOST STUDENTS IN THIS CLASS.	0.90
6.	WHEN I TALK, I HAVE MANNERISMS THAT DISTRACT FROM MY SPEAKING.	0.80
21.	I EXPRESS MYSELF CLEARLY ONLY ON THOSE SUBJECTS I KNOW WELL.	0.50
22.	MOST STUDENTS IN THIS CLASS AREN'T WORTH LISTENING TO.	0.50
24.	I HAVE DIFFICULTY ORGANIZING MY IDEAS.	0.50
50.	ALL IN ALL, I USE MY VOICE AND BODY WELL WHEN I TALK.	0.50
18.	MOST STUDENTS IN THIS CLASS ARE RUDE.	0.40
29.	I'D RATHER WATCH AND LISTEN THAN GET INTO A CONVERSATION.	0.40
15.	OTHER STUDENTS IN THIS CLASS WILL HELP ME OUT IF I HAVE A PROBLEM.	0.40
40.	I HAVE GREAT CONFIDENCE IN MANY OF MY OWN IDEAS.	0.40
1.	THERE ARE A LOT OF GREAT PEOPLE IN THIS CLASS.	0.40
48.	I USUALLY LET PEOPLE KNOW IF I LIKE OR DISLIKE THEM OR WHAT'S HAPPENING.	0.40
28.	THE STUDENTS IN THIS CLASS ARE BORING.	0.30
2.	I LIKE TO BE SEEN AND HEARD. IT MAKES ME FEEL GOOD TO KNOW THAT I'M IMPRESSING OTHERS.	0.30
4.	WHEN I SPEAK UP IN THIS CLASS, I USUALLY COME ACROSS COOL AND COLLECTED, EVEN WHEN I'M NERVOUS.	0.20
3.	MOST STUDENTS I KNOW TALK AND LIKTEN BETTER THAN I DO.	-0.00
42.	I'M BETTER THAN MOST STUDENTS AT KNOWING HOW OTHERS FEEL.	-0.10
41.	I ADAPT AND ADJUST WELL TO THE REACTIONS OF PEOPLE I'M TALKING TO.	-0.30
30.	I'M NOT AS INTERESTING AS MOST STUDENTS IN THIS CLASS.	-0.40
8.	I DON'T HAVE MUCH TO DO WITH THE STUDENTS IN THIS CLASS OUTSIDE IT'S OVER.	-0.40
35.	I USUALLY TRY TO GET OTHERS TO DO THINGS MY WAY.	-0.40
20.	I OFTEN FIND IT DIFFICULT TO EXPRESS WHAT I FEEL INSIDE OF ME.	-0.50
13.	WHEN I FEEL I'M RIGHT, I SPEAK UP.	-0.50
49.	IN GENERAL, I LEARN QUICKLY AND EASILY.	-0.60
25.	OTHER STUDENTS DON'T SEEM TO UNDERSTAND MY THOUGHTS AND FEELINGS.	-0.70
27.	OTHER STUDENTS THINK I'M SMART.	-0.70
43.	I'M BETTER AT SOME THINGS THAN MOST OF THE STUDENTS IN THIS CLASS.	-0.70
12.	WHEN OTHER STUDENTS IN THIS CLASS ARE HAVING PROBLEMS, I FIGURE IT'S NONE OF MY BUSINESS.	-0.70
10.	I DON'T LIKE TO TALK ABOUT MYSELF.	-0.80
20.	IT'S HARD FOR ME TO TALK OTHERS INTO DOING THINGS.	-0.80
9.	MY FEELINGS ARE EASILY HURT WHEN OTHER STUDENTS PUT ME DOWN.	-0.80
17.	IT BOTHERS ME WHEN OTHER STUDENTS DON'T LIKE WHAT I'M DOING.	-1.00
38.	I THINK THE TEACHER SHOULD MAKE STUDENTS OBEY CLASS RULES.	-1.10
7.	I TEND TO GIVE IN RATHER EASILY WHEN OTHERS PUT PRESSURE ON ME.	-1.20
26.	I DON'T LIKE TO ARGUE WITH OTHER STUDENTS.	-1.40
32.	OTHER STUDENTS SEEM TO IGNORE ME.	-1.60
14.	I FEEL UNEASY AROUND MOST STUDENTS IN THIS CLASS.	-1.60
45.	WHEN SOMETHING REALLY UPSETS ME, I MUST TALK TO SOMEONE ABOUT IT.	-1.70
39.	I CAN DO THE ASSIGNMENTS IN THIS CLASS RATHER QUICKLY AND EASILY.	-2.01